Summary of Task Force Comments

JOHNSON FAIN TEAM - Page 1 of 2

	Strengths	Weaknesses
--	-----------	------------

1. Vision, Outcomes and Understanding Specific Plan:

- Environmental footprint approach intriguing but vague
- Very general overview/approach thoughtful
- · History and informality emphasis good
- Experience with local market
- Success in previous projects/good vision
- Met objectives/understood Valley goals
- · Well prepared/researched & a good experience
- Good energy efficient concept/global reach
- No preconceived notions/want world class model
- Simple/good vision

- · Plan approach too conceptual
- Not familiar with current Plan
- How would they involve landowners?
- Process too vague
- They have already made up their mind
- Weak on economic and implementation
- Little discussion of jobs/housing integration
- Did not show how to get 25,000 units
- What is their overall approach to vision?
- Did not speak about high density/industry
- Not much in terms of style of planning
- More architects than planners
- Doesn't include wishes of businesses
- Only comparable project is Mission Bay
- Only addresses some aspects of the Plan

Other Comments:

- · Eager to please, but not a good vision
- Overall, strong on environment, but not whole picture

2. Overall Project Approach:

- Great visuals and examples of plan components
- Addressed the key elements
- Clear, well organized and have good vision
- Very concerned with environment/natural corridors
- Flexible approach and have the philosophy down
- Innovative iterative approach
- Open minded and experienced
- Excellent, but hard to tell in 15 minutes
- Like the idea of historic approach
- Liked idea of greenbelts and views to hills

- Approach too vague
- Unclear how they will bring public in
- How would they really do the Plan?
- Approach too oversimplified
- Not enough detail/light on planning
- Weak local involvement and consultants
- No discussion of graphics
- Has good experience with big projects

Summary of Task Force Comments

JOHNSON FAIN TEAM - Page 2 of 2

	Strengths	Weaknesses
3. Quality of Presentation:	-	
a. Organization:	 Good flow through the points Great visuals of plan components Very organized Well done Strong overall written presentation 	 Poorly organized and no theme Devoid of emphasis/weak examples No examples of how to do mixed use How would they deal with mixed density? Did not address implementation Superficial treatment of urban issues Too rushed and too general Hard to judge their sincerity Not enough detail/too "warm and fuzzy"
b. Substantive Content:	 Organized/complete and addressed Valley's goals Has worked on Master Plan Strong on environmental Simple in concept Strong philosophical ideas Strong experience Very good/covered sensitive points 	High tech classroom, too "pie in the sky"
c. Graphic Content:	 Good power point presentation Good graphics/colorful/relevant topics covered Conceptual only Accurate representation of Valley 	 Not as good as other teams. Did not show how they do visualization Should have had more specific examples Pictures did not accurately predict design Should have had photos of other projects

4.General Comments:

- Weak overall
- Refreshing candor in Q and A
- Sustainable development/good
- Staff should review their projects
- Ohlone and farming emphasis good
- Not in the same league as the other teams
- Seemed most concerned about environment
- Assumed that we'd read their materials
- · Emphasis on sense of place/history good
- · Like the idea of informality
- How to plan for 75,000 and keep informality?
- · Would like to see a local company involved
- They seem like they are being realistic